

# Tenses in Certain Orations of Cicero

by Jessie Lee Hart

*1904*

Submitted to the Department of Latin and Greek  
of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

Master Thesis

Ancient Languages

Hart, Jessie

1904

"Tenses in certain orations  
of Cicero."

Tenses in certain portions  
of Cicero.

Jessie Hart.



I. p. 173.

It is stated by Professor William Gardner Hale in an article on the 'Sequence of Tenses' which appeared in the *American Journal of Philology*, that the Latin Indicative acts in the same manner as the subjunctive with regard to sequence. After an examination of all subordinate Indicatives and Subjunctives in form of the 'Quintus' of Cicero (*In Catilinam Prima* et *Secunda*, *De Imperio Gnaei Pompei*, and *Pro Archia Poeta*) I have concluded that Mr. Hale is mistaken.

He has undoubtedly proved his point that every subordinate subjunctive has its individual meaning - 'tells its own temporal story', not depending on a principal verb for its time. However, I hope to show that the conclusion which he draws from this, namely, that 'no such thing as mechanical sequence exists', does not necessarily follow.

Since it is on these two arguments chiefly that Mr. Hale bases his theory of the non-existence of sequence, that theory would be seriously weakened by data showing that the Indicative does not act like the Subjunctive, and that the retention of meaning by subordinate Subjunctives does not impede a feeling of mechanical sequence.

The Rule of Sequence as stated in school grammars says that in the Subjunctive.



mode primary tenses are followed by primary and secondary ones by secondary.

This leaves the student to infer that the subordinate Subjunctives have no way of expressing time through themselves, but are wholly dependent in this matter on their main verbs. This is the form of the theory which Mr. Hale at first attacked, but as none could be found to dispute it, he went further, using it as an argument to prove that there is no such thing as sequence. I hope to show that the conclusion is not verified from this argument.

As regards the tense meanings in the Indicative, there are three possible points of view from which an act may be regarded, the past, the present, and the future. For each one there is an aoristic tense, which simply states the act as an occurrence, and two more definite tenses: i. e., there is an aoristic perfect which simply tells that a given act took place in the past, and there are two tenses, the  $\text{\textit{\text{P}}}$  imperfect and  $\text{\textit{\text{P}}}$  superperfect, which give a descriptive picture of the act at that past time. These definite tenses convey to the hearer three distinct ideas: 1. The point of view from which the speaker puts the act, i. e., the time-sphere (past, present, or future). 2. The stage of advancement at that point of time (completed, progressing,



got to be). 3. The temporal relation of the activity with reference to another verb, (priority, contemporaneity, or futurity). The auxiliary tenses differ from the true definite ones in that they fail to give the stage.

To sum up the tenses of the stage, one may say that they state an act as it was, is, or will be at a certain time, expressing both time-sphere and stage, and implying temporal relationship. They are, for the past, the pluperfect, the imperfect, and the periphrastic; for the present, the present perfect, the present, and the periphrastic; for the future, the future perfect, the future, and the periphrastic. In my classification I have regarded the copula alone as the periphrastic.

A brief explanation of the use of the tenses seems necessary. In narration the story advances by the successive mention of successive events, by use of the auxiliary perfect, the historical present, or the historical infinitive. The writer selects certain points which stand forth as the main events of the story, and states them in independent sentences. As events of minor importance present themselves to his mind, he pauses in the narrative, turning aside to describe a state of affairs, perhaps, as it was at the time of the main act; such description is

given by imperfects and pluperfects. Since Cicero concerns himself very little with narration, his main verbs are by no means limited to the past, there being a plentiful number of presents and futures. The present tense has two accessory tenses, the descriptive present and the present perfect, expressing a state of affairs in the present; the future has the descriptive future and the future perfect, expressing a state of affairs in the future.

Modifying circumstances are generally seen by a writer or speaker in temporal relationship to the acts which they modify, and so are expressed by the tenses which are accessory to their main verb. This natural temporal relationship may be regarded as logical sequence. However, the verbs may be in the same time-sphere and the subordinate one be an auxiliary instead of a descriptive tense. It is quite possible to combine different time-spheres in the same sentence, and here also any tense may be followed by either a descriptive or an auxiliary tense. Logical sequence embraces only those sentences in which the verbs are of the same time-sphere, the subordinate one being descriptive.

Thus, to treat the Indicative as if it were the Subjunctive, any tense may be followed by a present, present perfect, future,

future perfect, and also by the perfect with an adjectic meaning. These combinations come within the bounds of an Indicative 'Law of Sequence' as far as form is concerned, but the adjectic perfect is not a descriptive tense and therefore cannot be in logical sequence with any primary tense on which it depends. If any of the other tenses mentioned follows a primary tense of a different time-sphere, the sequence is again at fault logically, though the verbs are still formally in sequence. If, however, one of these primary tenses follows a secondary tense, it is clearly out of sequence as far as both form and time-sphere are concerned.

As regards secondary tenses, an imperfect or pluperfect may depend on any secondary tense and be both formally and logically in sequence, since in any case a descriptive verb of past time-sphere depends on a verb of that same time-sphere. If one of these secondary tenses depends on a primary, it is logically as well as formally out of sequence, since the time-spheres are certain to be different.

The great majority of Indicative examples are in sentences where the same time-sphere is preserved and the subordinate verb is descriptive. Satisfactory explanation can be given for a large proportion of those out



of sequence either logically or formally, though the number greatly exceeds the exceptions in the Subjunctive.

Coördinate, determining, and parenthetical clauses are favorite places for exceptions to occur, there being formal ones in coördinate clauses, in determining, and in parenthetical from a total of . Of logical exceptions are in coördinate clauses, in determining, and in parenthetical.

It is so natural for any coördinate clause to be out of sequence that this class of exception may be regarded as accounted for without discussion. I shall proceed to consider, then, special idioms and the thought combinations that would naturally result in exceptions to sequence.

# 1. Present-existing truth.

A fact that is true in all time may be related by a dependent present or independent when the main verb states a past event. As in English, these tenses may be used interchangeably in this construction, depending on the feeling of the speaker. It is possible, therefore, that no exception will occur, but equally possible that the subordinate verb will be either logically or formally out of sequence, or out in both ways, as the feeling of the speaker or writer varies. The large number of exceptions found in this class is proof that there is not, in the Indicative, a mechanical feeling for sequence.

Example - Sed eae res, quae ceteros remorari solent, non retardant.

A - Formally out. (In Catilinam I) admirandum est, II;

(In Cat. II) video, III; nitent, III; fulgent, II;

(De Im. Rom.) est II; est, II; ~~est~~, II; obstrictant, VII;  
solent, XIV; arbitrantur, XIV; facit, IV; potest, IV;  
vult, XX; ducitis, XII;

(Anchises) effers, VII; confirmat, I; indicat, I;

solent, III; obtinent, IV;

Total, 18.

## 2. Congruence.

When two acts take place at the same time, the one continuing through exactly the same temporal space as the other, they are expressed by the same tense, although one is subordinate. If the narrative is in past time both may be domestic perfects, and will thus be out of sequence both formally and logically.

Inam diu mihi ----- insidiatus es, non publico me caecidisti, sed privata diligentia defendi, (In Cat. I - 5).

A, Formally out - (In Cat. I) - insidiatus es, I;  
potui, III;

(De Imp. Pom.) dixisti, XX;

(Anchises) fuit, I;

total, 4

B.



### 3. Coincidence.

If two clauses are synonymous expressions of the same act, one being the exact equivalent of the other, they are expressed by the same tense, although one is made subordinate to the other. As in the case of Congruence, if auxiliary perfects are used, an exception to sequence results.

Tantum profecti tum, cum te a consulatu repuli, ut etc. (In Cat. I, 10)

A. Formally out -

(In Cat. I) repuli, I;

(In Cat. II) depulso est, I; conicimus, I;

profectus est, VII; visa est, XII;

Total, 5

#### 4. Pseudo-coïncidence.

An exception may arise from two auxiliary perfects in this construction. The subordinate verb must be *posse*, *velle*, *debere*, or *licet*, and its subject must be the same as that of the main verb. The sense must be such that the main verb may be added to the subordinate one in the infinitive form.

*Superiora illa, quamquam ferenda non fuerunt, tamen, ut potui, tuli.*

A. Formally out:

(In Cat. I) *potui*, VII.

(In Cat II) *voluit*, I.

Total, 2.

5. *Imm. clause of situation.*

This is a settled idiom in which the tense is regularly the present, no matter what the tense of the main verb may be.

*Haec dum nostri colligunt omnia diligentius, rex ipse e manibus effugit. (De Imp. Rom. IX.)*

4. *Formally out:*

*(de Imp. Rom.) colligunt, IX;*

*Total, 1.*

6. *Logically out:*

*(In Cat. II) redificant, IX; delectantur, IX;*

*Total, 2.*



6. Narrative clause with ubi, ut, postquam, or simulatque.

These introductory words are followed by the perfect active.

Nam, ut primum ex pueris excessit Archias, ----- se ad scribendi studium contulit. (A, II.)

A. Formally out:

(In Cat I) - adcedisti, VII;

(In Cat II) - incens est, VI; convocavi, VI;

(In Imp. Pm.) - venit, IX; profectus est, XII;

(Arch.) - excessit, III;

Total, 6.

# 7. 'ut dixi' type.

Such expressions as 'ut dixi' are often slipped in by Cicero as parenthetical and determining clauses. They may be used in narration of any time, but from the nature of the phrase the verb must remain a perfect active, and is thus likely to cause exceptions.

## 4. Formally out:

(De Imp. Pomp.) dixi, II;

Total, 1.

## 8. Logically out:

(In Cat I) dixi, XIII; dixi, VIII; dixi, IX;

(In Cat II) dixi, XII;

(De Imp. Pomp.) Crederam, XIII, (same use - might be correct.)

Total, 5.

8. 'ut aiant'.

This is a phrase of the same type as the preceding: i.e., from its very nature the verb must remain present, though it may be introduced parenthetically into narrative of any time.

Quot ego transpetitiones +++++ parva quidam declinatione et, ut aiant, corpore effugi! (Cat. I. IV)

Formally out:

(In Cat. I) aiant, VI;

(De Imp. Rom) dicitur, IX

Total, 2.

Logically out:

(In Cat. I) aiant, VI;

(De Imp. Rom) arbitror, XIX;

Total, 2



9. Present used freely for the future.

In conditions the present is sometimes used as it is in English where a future would be necessary if exactness were the standard. This usage causes logical exceptions to sequence.

Convincam, si negas. (In Cat. I, IV)

Logically out:

(In Cat. I) negas, IV;

(de Imp. Rom) habetis, XXIII;

Total, 2.

10. Past tense following a present or future.  
a. Subordinate tense a perfect aspect.

This is the most common logical exception in Cicero, almost every kind of clause furnishing examples of it. Although a speaker's mind is concerned with the present or future, he may very naturally give some descriptive setting which was true only in a time past with reference to his main verb and is not now existing.

- b. Subordinate tense imperfect or pluperfect.

When the dependent clause contains some such word as iam, tum, quondam, or any other expression which seems to give a past point of reference, the subordinate verb may be in the imperfect or pluperfect tense, though following a present or future. The exception is therefore both logical and formal.

a. si ea res, quas gessimus, vobis terrarum regionibus deferrentur. (Arch. I.)

b. Num dubitas id me impetrante facere, quod iam tua sponte faciebas?

a. Sonnet depending on present or future tense.  
Logically out-

(On Cat. I) occidit, I; oportuit, II; fuerunt, IV;  
effugimus, V; contigit, VII; vacuefacta sunt, VII;  
reliquerunt, VII; dedisti, VIII; dixisti, VIII; potuisti, VIII;  
constitutum fuit, IX; intendit, XII; biberunt, XIII;  
constitutus es, XIII; fecerunt, II; transtulisti, IX;  
(On Cat. II) extulit, egressus est, extorsimus, reliquit, I;

habuit, maluerunt, deservierunt, III; expectari, IV;  
volui, VIII; concupiscerunt, constituit, IX;  
putavit, voluerunt, XII; ingressus sum,  
voluerunt, XIII.

(de Imp. Pom.) voluistis, potuit, dederunt, dux-  
erunt, I; tradita est, gesserunt, II; fuistis,  
suscepit, egerunt, reliquerunt, provocavit, III;  
acciderunt, IV; necavit, fuit, V; gesserunt, VI;  
duximus, docuit, VII; dixi, VIII; fuit, IX; fuerunt,  
confusus est, explicavit, redundavit, patefactum  
est, conspexit, expectavit, XI; capta est, oppressa  
est, XII; dediderunt, venerunt, dixerunt, XVI;  
commissa sunt, dicta sunt, XVII; voluerunt,  
remansit, XVIII; detulit, conficit, XIX; delegatio,  
fecistis, concubistis, vidistis, attulistis, misimus,  
XXII;

(Archias) - fuit, I; tractata est, II; voluit, V;  
viderunt, VII; volavit, VIII; depressa est, fuit, IX;  
gessimus, X; coluerunt, XI; putaverunt, XII;  
innavit, XII; constituit, XIX. Total, 86.

b - Verb accompanied by word of fact situation.

Formally out:

(In Cat I) - faciebatur, II;

(In Cat II) - erat, I; solebant, XIII;

(de Imp. Pom) videbatur, XII; praeponebam, VII;

(Arch. collocavit, IV;

Total, 6.

# 11. Date clauses.

An Indictive verb with *cum*, which determines the time of action for the principle verb, is likely to be an aoristic perfect if it follows this tense.

Nam cum propter dilationem comitionum  
ter fractum primis centuriis cunctis renuntiatus  
sum, facile intellegi, Iurites, et quid de  
me indicaretis et quid alios praescriberetis

Formally ant:

(In Cat. I) profugerunt, I; voluisti, I;

(de Inf. Dom) renuntiatus sum, I; depoposcit,  
praepositus est,

Total, 5.

12. Exceptions caused by conditions contrary to fact in present time.

The imperfect tense in this construction is equal to a present, and therefore any tense which would be in sequence with a present is logically in sequence with one of these imperfects, though formally out.

Senri me hercule mei si me isto pacto met-  
uerent, ut metuerent omnes cives tui, domum meam  
relinquendam putarem. (Aeneas, VII.)

Formally out - logically in:

(In Cat. I) machinatio, I; metuerent, VII.

(In Cat. II) loquuntur, VI;

(de Imp. Pom.) genitur, IX;

(Aeneas) circumscriptum est (present perfect) XI.

Total, 5.

a. A present unfulfilled obligation is expressed by the imperfect tense. In two cases this imperfect which is equal to a present follows a present, causing a formal, though not a logical, exception.

---, quas ferro tuncidari oportebat, eos non  
dum voce vulnus! (In Cat. I, 4.)

Formally out; logically in:

(In Cat I) oportebat, IV.)

(In Cat II) oportebat, II)

Total, 2.



13. There are a number of exceptions which can be attributed to no idiom, but must be explained by the fact that the sense of the passage demands the use of the tense which Cicero has chosen. A probable place for these to occur is in

1- Generalizing conditions:

....., quotienscumque me petisti, per me tibi obstiti. (In Cat. I-II)

A. Formally out:

(In Cat. I) petisti, I; deferunt, XI;

(de Imp. Pom.) fuerunt, XII; susceptum est, XXIV;  
Total, 4

B. Logically out:

(de Imp. Pom.) est, prosum, I;

Total, 2.

2- Causal or adversative clauses.

Quamquam mihi semper ----- hic locus ...  
.. ad dicendum ornatissim<sup>(5)</sup>us est visus, Quirites,  
tamen hoc aditus laudis, -----, non mea me val-  
untas adhuc, sed vitae meae rationes ... prohibuerunt.  
(de Imp. Pom. I.)

Quare, quoniam id, quod est primum, -----  
facere nondum audeo, faciam id, etc.

A. Formally out:

(de Imp. Pom.) visus est, I; (quamquam);

(Arch.) valuit, (quod), I,

(In Cat. I) ferenda fuerunt, (quamquam) VII;

Total, 3

3- Logically out:

(In Cat. I) audes, (quoniam) I;

(In Cat. II) potest, (quoniam) I; cognoscitis,  
(tamen) XVII;

(de imp. Pom.) repulsemus, consequemur, (quod) XXIV,  
cognoscitis, (tamen) XVII;

(Unchins) attenditis, (quoniam) VIII. Total, 6

(Other examples have been counted under present-  
existing truths and axioms following present or future)

3- Present truths depending on future verbs.

-----, faciam id, quod est ad severitatem lenius,  
et ad communem salutem utilius. (In Cat. I-II.)

Logically out:

(In Cat. I) vivis, II; est, I; loquor, I; abhorret, VIII;  
contines, VIII; compuncti (pass), vides, sentis, II;  
sentiant, XII; videntur, affliguntur, est, nom.  
inamus, XIII;

(In Cat. II) cupiunt, IX; suppeditantur, eget, XI;

praemissi (pass), videtis, XII; videtur, XII; putant, X;

(de imp. Pom.) sunt, VI; mirantur, XII; oportet, XXIV.

(Unch.). est, IX; proficitur, est, XII; conceditur, tribunt, II; 28.

4- It is impossible to classify some of the  
exceptions. They are in parenthetical or  
determining clauses and there is often no  
temporal relation between the two verbs,  
whereby one might be put in a subordinate  
descriptive tense:

qui saepius cum hoste conflictat, quam quis-

quam cum inimico concertavit. (de Imp. Rom. I).

Formally out:

(In Cat. I) constituti fuerunt, VII) solebas, IX;

(In Cat. II) iucio, VI; agit, VII;

(de Imp. Rom.) patuit, I; denotarit, III; putavit, IX;

ausus est, IX; concertavit, legemur, concenserunt,

X; vidimus, audimus, XI; navigavit, XII;

inducit, XVI; detulerunt, XVI; superaverunt,

vicerunt, XVIII; valuerunt, ~~con~~ nominis, XIX;

(Anchiro) - perditae sunt, VII; effusus, VII; adaequa-

vit, X; donavit, X; bellavit, II; favit, IV;

criminatoris, V; gressimus, XI; Total, 28.

Logically out:

(In Cat. I) sentio, VI.

(Anch.) peribitur, X.

Total, 2.

There is a logical exception in the Anchiro  
oration which cannot be classified with  
any of the rest.

... I cum ceteri ... inreperunt, hic  
reicetur?

Logically out:

(Anchiro) inreperunt, V;

Total, 1.

There are exceptions not to be explained since a tense which is not the one to be expected naturally is used.

*His tandem aliquando, quo te iam pridem ista tua cupiditas effrenata ac furiosa rapiebat.* (Cat. I, 10.)

Formally out:

(In Cat. I) rapiebat, II;

(de Imp. Pom) putaristis, IX; admonui, XV;  
Total, 3.

Two verbs are formally out of sequence in a condition of fact.

*Etenim, si summi viri ----- non modo se non contaminant, sed honestant, certe venendum mihi non erat, ne etc.*

Total

Formally out:

(In Cat. I) contaminant, honestant, XII;  
Total, 2.

## Summary.

- |  |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| 1. Present existing truth:<br>Formally out:          | 18. |    |
| 2. Congruence:<br>Formally out-                      | 4   |    |
| 3. Coincidence:<br>Formally out-                     | 5   |    |
| 4. Pseudo-Coincidence:<br>Formally out-              | 2   |    |
| 5. Non-clause:<br>Formally out,<br>Logically out     | 1   | 2. |
| 6. Ubi, ut, postquam idiom:<br>Formally out-         | 6   |    |
| 7. ut dixi type:<br>Formally out-<br>Logically out-  | 1   | 5. |
| 8. ut ainnt type:<br>Formally out-<br>Logically out- | 2   | 2  |
| 9. present used for future:<br>Logically out-        |     | 2  |

10- Past tense following a present or future:  
Formally out -  
Logically out -

6

86

11- Date clauses:-  
Formally out-

5

12- Dependant on conditions contrary to fact:  
Formally out- (logically in)

7

13- Miscellaneous:  
Formally out-  
Logically out-

40

39

Total:

Formally out -	90
Logically out -	143
In sequence -	309

Coördinates are not included in these totals. Of these there are:

Formally out -	34
Logically out -	18
In -	51



## Subjunctive mode -

An examination of Subjunctives shows that each tense has the temporal power of the Indicative tense of the same name, and in addition, a future power. That is, the present serves as a present or future; the imperfect as imperfect or future to the past; the perfect as either perfect or future perfect; and the pluperfect as either pluperfect or future perfect to the past. The Subjunctive tenses, like the Indicative, indicate time-sphere and stage.

Various feelings, such as will, wish, etc., were expressed by the original Subjunctive, and these may be regarded as its true meaning. In constructions where the tense meaning is the same as the Indicative, the Subjunctive may be regarded as having developed these additional meanings from its true ones. Such a case is found in result clauses when the imperfect is used after an *adversative* where the meaning would naturally require an *adversative*. Mr. Hale has explained this quite satisfactorily. He says that in 'tam fortiter pugnaverunt ut vincerent' the result clause has developed the meaning 'so that they did conquer' from the original 'whenever they would naturally'; in which the imperfect Subjunctive has its true meaning. The tense and the mode remain as they originally were, though the natural mode of expression would be the *adversative* Indicative. The

fact that so few exceptions occur in this construction goes far to prove the existence of a mechanical feeling for sequence in the Subjunctive.

In consideration of exceptions to sequence in the Subjunctive, a very much smaller percentage will be found to exist than in the Indicative.

1. Coriat following a present or future.  
(This class has already been explained under the Indiatives.)

Qua re nolite dubitare, quoniam huic viri credatis omnia, qui inter tot annos nunc inventus sit, quem --- venire gaudeant. (de Imp. Rom. XIII.)

Logically out:

- (In Lat. I) egre, fregit, convocaverit, cepit, I;  
revocavit, II;  
(In Lat. II) exivit, II; attributa sit, deproposuerit, III;  
concepit, II; emisim, ecessim, profectus sit,  
accidit, VII;  
(de Imp. Rom.) misenitis, venit, V; concurratis, VI;  
superavit, exvenit, I; transmisim, redempti-  
sint, pervenerint, gesta sint, III; venient, derivent,  
reliquerint, fecerint, fecerint, pervenerint, XIII;  
indicaverint, timuerint, dilexerint, XIV; pervaserint  
XV; profecerint, defenderint, XV; gesserint, adven-  
serint, abtemperaverint, obediaverint, obsecunda-  
verint, XVI; eduxerint, XIX; constituta sint, XX;  
inventus sit, XXIII; revocavit, IX.  
(Archias) contulerint, IX; duxerimus, XII; arceant,  
retardaverint, abstraxerint, VI; pervenerint, V.  
Total, 49.

## 2. Result clauses -

a. The aorist instead of an imperfect.

This is the construction mentioned before, in which the imperfect is equivalent to an aorist and in a few cases has sacrificed form to meaning. (Result - Characterizing.)

*Santa diligentia fuit ut ad praetorium venerit et dixerit.* (Cicero, I.)

Formally out:

(Cat. I)

(Cat. II) *ascirent*, IV;

(de Imp. Pom.)

(Cicero) *venerit*, *dixerit*, V.

Total, 3.

b. Present result of a past act.

... *divina virtus tam brevi tempore lucem ad  
ferre rei publicae potuit, ut vos ---- nunc  
----- audiat.* (Cicero) (XII) de Imp. Pom.)

Formally out.

(de Imp. Pom.) *videantur*, IV; *audiat*, XII;  
*dicatur*, XIII;

Total, 3

c. Future result of a present act.

*ut sumptum faciat in militem, nemini vis adferatur.*

Logically out:

(In Cat. II) *audiat*, VII; *defendant*, VIII;

(de Imp. Pom.) *faciat*, XIII;

Total, 3.

3- Present following a future in indirect questions:

Requiritur fore scire nunc quem ad modum  
----- peliquum posset magnum esse bellum.  
(de imp. Rom. II)

Logically out:

(de Cat. II) componentur, III;

(de imp. Rom) posset, IX;

Total, 2

4- Substantive quod clause:

Ac si quis est --- qui ---- me -- accuset, quod  
tam capitalis hostem non comprehenderim. (Cat. II-2).

Logically out:

(Cat. II) comprehenderim, 2;

Total, 1

5. Potiusquam coordinate in effect:

me -- accuset, quod --- hostem non compre-  
henderim potius quam emiserim.

Formally out:

(Cat. II) emiserim, 2;

Total, 1.

6- Two examples are formally out of sequence but logically in.

Meminiſtine me ante diem XII Kalendas Novembres dicere in ſenatu, ſane in annis centis die, qui dies futurus eſſet.... (Cat I-3)

(The date here gives a fact ſituation for future, making it in effect past.)

Sed cum ſint homines qui.... dicant, idem, ſi interfectus eſſet, quid dicent. (Cat II-7)

(The present depends on an imperfect equal to a present in a condition contrary to fact.)

Formally out - logically in:

(Cat I) futurus eſſet, 3;

(Cat II) ſint, 7;

Total, 2.

1- One exception results from the habit of considering novi a present perfect, though in this case it can be nothing but an aorist.

Sum quantum concilio....valeat, -- voo, Iuvites, hoc ipſo ex loco ſaepe cognoviſtis. (de Imp. Pom. XIV)

Total, 1

Formally out:

(de Imp. Pom) valeat, XIV;

Total, 1



# Summary of Subjunctives.

1- Coniunct following a present or future:  
Logically ant- 48.

2- Result clauses:  
Formally ant- 6  
Logically ant- 3

3- Present in indirect questions. (after future)  
Logically ant- 2

4- Substantive quod:  
Logically ant- 1

5- Coördinate in effect  
Formally ant- 1

6- Formally ant- logically in- 2.

7- Coniunct considered as present perfect. - Formally ant- 1.

Total.

Formally ant- 10.

Logically ant- 55.

In sequence. 434.

These numbers are exclusive of sentences introduced by coördinating relatives.

Coördinatives:

Formally ant- 5.

Logically ant- 8.

In- 2.

This great difference in the percentage of exceptions in the subjunctive as compared with the indicative is explained by Mr. Hale by the fact that the great majority of dependent indicatives are less closely related to their principal verbs than the subjunctives are. This is no doubt true, but if a construction can be found which has exactly parallel usage in the two modes, and the unequal ratio still exists, we shall be justified in standing for the mechanical feeling for sequences. I have counted examples from two constructions on this point - they are:

1- Causal clauses.

2- General truths.

1- When Cicero wishes to express a fact reason for a fact act, he uses without apparent distinction the subjunctive with cum, or the indicative with quod, quia, etc. But when he expresses a present reason for a fact act, he chooses to use the indicative in preference to the subjunctive, though of course an exception arises in either case. There are not many examples of this kind in the four orations, not enough on which to form a theory, but they are worth consideration.

Indicative:

## Indicative.

### In sequence:

(Archias) colebant, III; (~~de Imp. Rom.~~)

1.

### Formally ant:

(Archias) confirmat, indicat, II.

1.

## Subjunctive:

### In sequence.

(Cat. I) virenem, IV;

(~~de Imp. Rom.~~) navigaret, VI;

(Archias) esset; putaretur, IV;

4

## 2 - General truths.

When a general truth depends on a fact verb, it is either present or imperfect, if Indicative, but when the general truth must be told in the Subjunctive, it is invariably imperfect, evidently for the purpose of keeping it in sequence with its main verb.

### Indicative:

#### In sequence:

(Cat. II) meritis erat, I; videbam, II;

(Archias) colebant, II;

3.

#### Formally ant:

(Cat. II) video, nitent, fulgent, III;

(~~de Imp. Rom.~~) est, est, II; Lucitis, XII; solent, arbitram-  
tur, XIV; facit, potest, XV;

(Arch.) confirmat, indicat, II; solet, III; obtinent, II; 14.

## Subjunctive:

### In Sequence:

- (Cat. I) placent, II; videntur, VI; essem, contineremur, VIII; praestolarentur, IX; possem, nominaretur, X; impenderet, putarem, XII;  
(Cat. II) indicarem, II;  
(de Imp. Rom.) esset, X; contrisset = imperfect, XIV;  
auderet, XVI; videremur, ~~XVII~~; XIX; dependet, XVIII;  
videremur, XXIII;  
(Arch.) . esset, IV; putaretur, IV;

18.

My belief, then, in regard to sequence, is that every tense of the Subjunctive has its own meaning; and that this meaning is inseparable from it. Besides this, as is shown by Mr. Hale's explanation of the imperfect in result clauses, and by the fact that in four orations of Cicero, no exception occurs in the Subjunctive in causal clauses or general truths, when they follow a past verb, I conclude that there was a feeling for sequence in the Subjunctive, - that this feeling influenced Cicero to avoid exceptions when it was possible for him to attain the same end by use of the Indicative.



University of Kansas Libraries



3 3838 100531995